arXiv:1408.3292v2 [math.CO] 18 Nov 2014

ON THE ERDŐS-KO-RADO THEOREM AND THE BOLLOBÁS THEOREM FOR t-INTERSECTING FAMILIES

DONG YEAP KANG, JAEHOON KIM, AND YOUNJIN KIM

Abstract. A family $\mathcal{F}$ is *t-intersecting* if any two members have at least t common elements. Erdős, Ko, and Rado [4] proved that the maximum size of a t-intersecting family of subsets of size k is equal to $\binom{n-t}{k-t}$ if $n \geq n_0(k,t)$. Alon, Aydinian, and Huang [1] considered families generalizing intersecting families, and proved the same bound. In this paper, we give a strengthening of their result by considering families generalizing t-intersecting families for all $t \geq 1$. In 2004, Talbot [12] generalized Bollobás's Two Families Theorem [2] to t-intersecting families. In this paper, we proved a slight generalization of Talbot's result by using the probabilistic method.

1. Introduction

Let $[n]$ be the set $\{1,\dots,n\}$ and t be a positive integer. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $[n]$ is t-intersecting if $|F_i \cap F_j| \geq t$ for every pair of two subsets $F_i, F_j \in \mathcal{F}$. A family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $[n]$ is k-uniform if it is a collection of k-subsets of $[n]$, and we also say that it has rank k if the largest set in it has size k. Erdős, Ko, and Rado [4] proved that there exists $n_0(k,t)$ such that if $n \geq n_0(k,t)$, then the maximum size of a k-uniform t-intersecting family of subsets of $[n]$ is $\binom{n-t}{k-t}$. The following generalization of Erdős, Ko, and Rado (EKR) Theorem was proved by Frankl [6] for $t \geq 15$, and was completed by Wilson [13] for all t by obtaining the smallest n for the theorem to be true.

Theorem 1.1 (Frankl [6], Wilson [13])**.** *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a k-uniform t-intersecting family of subsets of $[n]$, then we have*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-t}{k-t}$$

whenever $n \geq (k-t+1)(t+1)$.

There is also an EKR-type theorem for t-intersecting families with bounded rank: if $n \geq (k-t+1)(t+1)$, then the maximum size of a t-intersecting family of subsets of sizes at most k is equal to $\binom{n-t}{k-t} + \binom{n-t}{k-1-t} + \cdots + \binom{n-t}{0}$. In this paper we give the following strengthening of this theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let n,k,t be integers such that $n \geq (k-t+1)(t+1)$. Let a collection of sets $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$ satisfies the following. Suppose that for any $A,B \in \mathcal{F}$ with $|A \cap B| < t$, $|A \triangle B| \leq k-t$*

Date: November 19, 2014.

The first author and second author were partially supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning (2011-0011653).

The second author was also partially supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007–2013) / ERC Grant Agreements no. 306349 (J. Kim).

The third author was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning (2013R1A1A3010982) (Y. Kim).

Corresponding author: Younjin Kim.

holds. Then we have

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-t}{k-t} + \binom{n-t}{k-1-t} + \cdots + \binom{n-t}{0}.$$

Alon, Aydinian, and Huang [1] gave the following strengthening of the bounded rank EKR theorem when $t = 1$: $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-t}{k-t} + \binom{n-t}{k-1-t} + \cdots + \binom{n-t}{0}$ holds for all pairs A, B with $|A \cap B| < 1$ when $|A \triangle B| \leq k$, instead of $|A \triangle B| \leq k-1$. However, the condition $|A \triangle B| \leq k-t$ in Theorem 1.2 cannot be replaced with $|A \triangle B| \leq k-t+1$ for $t \geq 2$ because of the following example.
For $t < k < n$, consider $\mathcal{F} = \{A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k} : [t] \subseteq A\} \cup \{A \subseteq [t] : |A| = t-1\}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ contains $\binom{n-t}{k-t} + \binom{n-t}{k-1-t} + \cdots + \binom{n-t}{0} + t$ sets while every two sets with $|A \cap B| \leq t-1$ satisfies $|A \triangle B| \leq k-t+1$. Thus our condition $|A \triangle B| \leq k-t$ is best possilbe when $t \geq 2$.

We also extend results regarding cross t-intersecting families in the same manner. We say that families $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r$ of subsets of $[n]$ are cross t-intersecting if $|A \cap B| \geq t$ for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_i$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_j$, where $i \neq j$. In 2013, Borg [3] obtained the maximum product of sizes of cross t-intersecting families with bounded rank as follows. In this paper, we also show Theorem 1.4, a strengthening of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.3 (Borg [3])**.** *For $1 \leq t \leq k \leq n$, there exists $n_0(k,t)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(k,t)$ the maximum size of product of families $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ is equal to*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k_i - t} \binom{n-t}{k_i - t - j} \right)$$

when $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r$ are cross t-intersecting families.

Theorem 1.4. *For $1 \leq t \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_r \leq n$, there exists $n_0(k_{r-1}, k_r, t)$ such that the following holds for all $n \geq n_0(k_{r-1}, k_r, t)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r$ be families of subsets of $[n]$ of size at most $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r$, respectively. If every $A \in \mathcal{F}_i$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_j$ with $|A \cap B| < t$ satisfies $|A \triangle B| \leq \min\{k_i, k_j\} - t$, then we have*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} |\mathcal{F}_i| \leq \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k_i - t} \binom{n-t}{k_i - t - j} \right).$$

Next, we consider r-wise intersecting families. We say that a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ is r-wise intersecting if $F_1 \cap F_2 \cap \cdots \cap F_r \neq \emptyset$ holds for all $F_i \in \mathcal{F}, 1 \leq i \leq r$. In the following Theorem 1.6, we give a strengthening of the bounded-rank version of Frankl's result [5] when $\mathcal{F}$ is an r-wise intersecting family.

Theorem 1.5 (Frankl [5])**.** *Let $(r-1)n \geq rk$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ be an r-wise intersecting family. Then we have*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}.$$

Theorem 1.6. *Let $(r-1)n \geq rk$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$ satisfies the following. Suppose that for any $F_1, F_2, \cdots, F_r \in \mathcal{F}$ if $F_1 \cap F_2 \cap \cdots \cap F_r = \emptyset$, $|\cup_{i=1}^{r} F_i - \cap_{i=1}^{r} F_i| \leq k$ holds. Then we have*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k-2} + \cdots \binom{n-1}{0}.$$

The following Bollobás's Two Families Theorem [2] is an important and well-known result in Extremal Set theory. This theorem has been generalized in many directions. In 1982, Frankl [7] proved a skew version of Theorem 1.7. The further generalizations of Theorem 1.7 were given by Füredi [9], Lovász [11], and Talbot [12]. In 2004, Talbot [12] generalized Bollobás's two families theorem [2] to t-intersecting families. We prove Theorem 1.9, an improvement of Talbot's result, by using the probabilistic method. It also becomes to reprove Talbot's Theorem 1.8. Note that the conditions (c') in Theorem 1.9 is weaker than the condition (c) of Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 1.7 (Bollobás [2])**.** *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{(A_i, B_i) : i \in I\}$ be a finite collection of pairs of finite sets such that $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset \iff i = j$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{i\in I} \binom{|A_i| + |B_i|}{|A_i|}^{-1} \leq 1.$$

Theorem 1.8 (Talbot [12])**.** *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{(A_i, B_i) : i \in I\}$ be a finite collection of pairs of finite sets and t be a nonnegative integer such that*

(a) $|A_i \cap B_i| \leq t \quad for\ each\ i \in I$

(b) $|A_i \cap B_j| \geq t \quad for\ i, j \in I\ and\ i \neq j$

(c) If $A_i \cap B_i = A_j \cap B_j\ for\ i \neq j \quad then\ A_i \cap B_j \neq A_i \cap B_i \neq A_j \cap B_i.$

Then we have

$$\sum_{i\in I} \binom{|A_i \cup B_i|}{|A_i - B_i|}^{-1} \binom{|B_i|}{|A_i \cap B_i|}^{-1} \leq 1.$$

Theorem 1.9. *When $t \geq 1$, even if we replace the condition (c) in Theorem 1.8 with the following weaker condition*

(c') If $A_i \cap B_i = A_j \cap B_j\ for\ i \neq j \quad then\ A_i \cap B_j = A_i \cap B_i = A_j \cap B_i\ does\ not\ hold$

we still have

$$\sum_{i\in I} \binom{|A_i \cup B_i|}{|A_i - B_i|}^{-1} \binom{|B_i|}{|A_i \cap B_i|}^{-1} \leq 1.$$

Note that the above conditions in Theorem 1.9 are sharp in the sense that we cannot replace (c) with (c') when $t = 0$ without changing the conclusion because of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.10. *(Király, Nagy, Pálvölgyi and Visontai* [10]*) Let a, b be two relatively prime integers. There exists a finite collection of pairs of finite sets $\mathcal{F} = \{(A_i, B_i) : |A_i| = a, |B_i| = b, i \in I\}$ with $A_i \cap B_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in I$. Moreover, $A_i \cap B_j = A_i \cap B_i = A_j \cap B_i = \emptyset$ does not hold for any $i \neq j$ and*

$$\sum_{i\in I} \binom{|A_i \cup B_i|}{|A_i - B_i|}^{-1} \binom{|B_i|}{|A_i \cap B_i|}^{-1} = |I| \binom{a+b}{a}^{-1} \geq 2 - \frac{1}{a+b}.$$

2. Proof of Theorems

For a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $[n]$ of size at most k, we define the transformation $S_{i,k}$ as follows.

$$S_{i,k,\mathcal{F}}(A) := \begin{cases} A \cup \{i\} & \text{if } A \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{F} \text{ and } |A| < k \\ A & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Also, let $S_{i,k}(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_{i,k,\mathcal{F}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

Claim 2.1. *A tuple of families $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r)$ is given with $\mathcal{F}_j \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k_j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$ and $k = \min_j\{k_j\}$ satisfying the following*

$$\text{If } |\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| < t \text{ for } F_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, \text{ then } |\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| \leq k - t \text{ holds.} \tag{1}$$

Then, for $i \in [n]$, $(S_{i,k_1}(\mathcal{F}_1), S_{i,k_2}(\mathcal{F}_2), \cdots, S_{i,k_r}(\mathcal{F}_r))$ also satisfies (1).

Proof. Suppose that we have $F_j \in \mathcal{F}_j$ such that $F'_j = S_{i,k,\mathcal{F}_j}(F_j)$ with $|\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F'_j| < t$ and $|\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F'_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F'_j| > k - t$. Since $\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j$ is a subset of $\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F'_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F'_j$ with size at most $k - t$, we have

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F'_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F'_j = \{i\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j.$$

Hence i does not belong to any of F_j and belongs to some, not all of F'_j. Assume that i does not belong to $F'_1, \cdots, F'_l$ and belongs to $F'_{l+1}, \cdots, F'_r$.

Case 1. There exists j with $|\mathbf{F_j}| \geq \mathbf{k}$.

Since $|\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| < t$, we have

$$|\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| \geq |F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| > k - t.$$

It is a contradiction.

Case 2. $|\mathbf{F_j}| < \mathbf{k}$ for all j.

For $j \geq l + 1$, we have $S_{i,k,\mathcal{F}}(F_j) = F'_j = F_j \cup \{i\}$ because of $i \in F'_j$. For $j \leq l$, we also have $S_{i,k,\mathcal{F}}(F_j) = F'_j = F_j$ because of $i \notin F'_j$. The condition $k \leq k_j$ implies that $F_j \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}_j$ for $j \leq l$. Then we have

$$|\bigcap_{j=1}^{r-1} F_j \cap (F_r \cup \{i\})| < t \text{ and } |(F_r \cup \{i\}) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{r-1} F_j - ((F_r \cup \{i\}) \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^{r-1} F_j)| = k - t + 1.$$

It is a contradiction. Hence such F_js do not exist, and $(S_{i,k_1}(\mathcal{F}_1), S_{i,k_2}(\mathcal{F}_2), \cdots, S_{i,k_r}(\mathcal{F}_r))$ also satisfies (1). $\square$

We say that a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$ is an up-set if $A \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all A and i such that $A \in \mathcal{F} \cap \binom{[n]}{\leq k-1}$ and $i \notin A$.

Claim 2.2. *A tuple of families $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r)$ is given with $\mathcal{F}_j \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k_j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$ and $k = \min_j\{k_j\}$. If it satisfies (1) and $\mathcal{F}_j$s are up-sets for all j, then $|\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| \geq t$ holds for any $F_j \in \mathcal{F}_j$.*

Proof. Suppose that we have $F_j \in \mathcal{F}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ with $|\bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| < t$. By the condition, $|\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j - \bigcap_{j=1}^{r} F_j| \leq k - t$ holds. It means $|\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j| < k - 1$, so $[n] - \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j$ is not empty because of $n \geq k$. Let $[n] - \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j = \{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_l\}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_1$ is an up-set, $F_1 \cup \{i_1\}$ is also in $\mathcal{F}_1$ unless $|F_1| = k_1$. By repeatedly adding this element $i_1, i_2, \ldots$ to F_1 until we cannot, we find a new

set $F_1'' \in \mathcal{F}_1$ satisfying $|F_1''| = k_1$ or $F_1'' = F_1 \cup ([n] - \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} F_j)$. In any case, we have

$$\left| \left(F_1'' \cup \bigcup_{j=2}^{r} F_j \right) - \left(F_1'' \cap \bigcap_{j=2}^{r} F_j \right) \right| \geq \min\{k_1 - (t-1), n - (t-1)\} \geq k - t + 1.$$

It is a contradiction. □

For a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$, we let $\mathcal{F}^0 = \mathcal{F}$ and take $\mathcal{F}^{i+1} = S_{n,k}(S_{n-1,k}(\cdots(S_{1,k}(\mathcal{F}^i)\cdots)$ for all $i \geq 0$. If $\mathcal{F}^{j+1} = \mathcal{F}^j$, then we get an up-set $\mathcal{F}^j$ and we let $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}^j$. We also have $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}^i|$ for all $i \geq 0$ since $S_{i,k}$ does not change the size of a family in $\binom{[n]}{\leq k}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $n \geq (k-t+1)(t+1)$. We take $\mathcal{F}'$ as above which has the same size with $\mathcal{F}$ and which is an up-set. By Claim 2.1 with $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}$ and $r = 2$, we say that the up-set $\mathcal{F}'$ has the property (1) as $\mathcal{F}$ does. Then, Claim 2.2 with $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}$ implies that the up-set $\mathcal{F}'$ is t-intersecting. Hence, we have that

$$|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}'| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-t} \binom{n-t}{k-i-t}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $1 \leq t \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_r \leq n$ and $n \geq n_0(k_{r-1}, k_r, t)$ with $n_0(k_{r-1}, k_r, t)$ as in Theorem 1.2 in [3]. For each $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\leq k_i}$, we define $\mathcal{F}_i'$ by repeatedly applying S_{j,k_i} for all j as above. Then $\mathcal{F}_1', \mathcal{F}_2', \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r'$ are up-sets satisfying (1) having the same size with $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r$, respectively. By Claim 2.1, we have $|A \triangle B| \leq \min\{k_i, k_j\} - t$ for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_i', B \in \mathcal{F}_j'$ with $|A \cap B| < t$. For all possible pair of two distinct numbers $j_1, j_2 \in [n]$, we apply Claim 2.2 with $\mathcal{F}_{j_1}', \mathcal{F}_{j_2}'$. Then we can conclude that $\mathcal{F}_1', \mathcal{F}_2', \cdots, \mathcal{F}_r'$ are cross t-intersecting. By Theorem 1.3, we have that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} |\mathcal{F}_i| = \prod_{i=1}^{r} |\mathcal{F}_i'| \leq \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k_i - t} \binom{n-t}{k_i - t - j} \right).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $n \geq (k-t+1)(t+1)$. We take $\mathcal{F}'$ as above which has the same size with $\mathcal{F}$ and which is an up-set. By Claim 2.1 with $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = \cdots = \mathcal{F}_r = \mathcal{F}$, we say that an up-set $\mathcal{F}'$ has the property (1) with $t = 1$ as $\mathcal{F}$ does. Then, Claim 2.2 with $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = \cdots = \mathcal{F}_r = \mathcal{F}$ implies that the up-set $\mathcal{F}'$ is intersecting. We let $\mathcal{F}'[i]$ denote the collection of all sets of size i in $\mathcal{F}'$, then $\mathcal{F}'[i]$ is also intersecting. Hence, Theorem 1.5 implies $|\mathcal{F}'[i]| \leq \binom{n-1}{i-1}$.
Hence, we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}'| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathcal{F}'[i]| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \binom{n-1}{i-1}.$$

□

3. A probablistic proof of Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9

In this section, we prove both Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9 in the probabilistic argument. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{(A_i, B_i) : i \in I\}$ be a finite collection of pairs of finite sets satisfying the conditions on Theorems. Let $[n] = \bigcup_{i\in I} A_i \cup B_i$ and $|I| = k$. A permutation $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ on $[n]$ is *properly separating* (A_i, B_i), where $i \in I$, if $x_s \in A_i - B_i$ and $x_l \in B_i$ implies $s < l$ and $x_s \in A_i$ and $x_l \in B_i - A_i$ also implies $s < l$. Then all elements of $A_i - B_i$ should be on the left side of B_i, and all elements of $B_i - A_i$ should be on the right side of A_i in the permutation σ that properly separates (A_i, B_i).

Claim 3.1. *Any permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ does not properly separate both (A_i, B_i) and (A_j, B_j), $i \neq j$.*

Proof. Suppose $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ properly separates both (A_i, B_i) and (A_j, B_j), where $i \neq j$. Note that $\max\{i|x_i \in A_i\} \leq \max\{i|x_i \in B_i\}$ by the definition of proper separation.
We define the following indices

$$i_b = \min\{s \mid x_s \in B_i\}, i_a = \max\{s \mid x_s \in A_i\}, j_b = \min\{l \mid x_l \in B_j\}, j_a = \max\{l \mid x_l \in A_j\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $j_b \leq i_b$.

Case 1. $t = 0$**.**

Since $A_j \cap B_j = \emptyset$ and σ properly separates (A_j, B_j), we have $j_a < j_b$. Thus $j_a < j_b \leq i_b$, so we conclude that $A_j \cap B_i = \emptyset$. It is a contradiction to the condition (c).

Case 2. $t \geq 1$**.** Since $j_b \leq i_b$, we have

$$A_j \cap B_i \quad = \{x_l \mid x_l \in A_j \,,\, l \geq i_b\} \subseteq \{x_l \mid x_l \in A_j \,,\, l \geq j_b\} = A_j \cap B_j.$$

This with the conditions (a) and (b) imply that

$$|A_j \cap B_i| = |A_j \cap B_j| = t \geq 1.$$

Since $A_j \cap B_j$ is nonempty, $x_{j_b} \in A_j \cap B_j = A_j \cap B_i \subseteq B_i$. By our choice, i_b is the minimum index of B_i, we have $i_b \leq j_b$. Then we conclude $i_b = j_b$. Hence,

$$A_i \cap B_j = \{x_l \mid x_l \in A_i \,,\, l \geq j_b\} = \{x_l \mid x_l \in A_i \,,\, l \geq i_b\} = A_i \cap B_i.$$

Again by conditions (a) and (b), $A_i \cap B_j = A_i \cap B_i$ has size t.

If $i_a \geq j_a$, we get

$$A_j \cap B_i \quad = \{x_l \mid x_l \in B_i \,,\, l \leq j_a\}\} \subseteq \{x_l \mid x_l \in B_i \,,\, l \leq i_a\} = A_i \cap B_i.$$

If $i_a \leq j_a$, we get

$$A_i \cap B_j \quad = \{x_l \mid x_l \in B_i \,,\, l \leq i_a\}\} \subseteq \{x_l \mid x_l \in B_i \,,\, l \leq j_a\} = A_j \cap B_j.$$

One of $i_a \geq j_a$ and $i_a \leq j_a$ must hold. Then either $A_j \cap B_i = A_i \cap B_i$ or $A_i \cap B_j = A_j \cap B_j$ holds, where $i \neq j$. In any case, we conclude that $A_i \cap B_j = A_j \cap B_j = A_i \cap B_i = A_j \cap B_j$ for $t \geq 1$. It is a contradiction to the condition (c'). $\square$

Pick a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ uniformly and independently, and let E_i be the event that σ properly separates (A_i, B_i). Then the events $E_1, E_2, ..., E_k$ are mutually disjoint, and $\Pr[E_i] = \binom{|A_i \cup B_i|}{|A_i - B_i|}^{-1} \binom{|B_i|}{|A_i \cap B_i|}^{-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then we conclude that

$$\Pr\left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} E_i\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Pr[E_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \binom{|A_i \cup B_i|}{|A_i - B_i|}^{-1} \binom{|B_i|}{|A_i \cap B_i|}^{-1} \leq 1$$

as desired.

4. Acknowledgement

The authors are indebted to the anonymous referee who gave us valuable comments and pointed out a mistake in the former proof of Theorem 1.9.

References

[1] N. Alon, H. Aydinian and H. Huang, *Maximizing the number of nonnegative subsets*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., to appear, 2014.
[2] B. Bollobás, *On generalized graphs*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **16** (1965) 447-452.
[3] P. Borg, *The maximum product of sizes of cross t-intersecting uniform families*, submitted 2013.
[4] P. Erdős, C. Ko and R. Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*. Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser., **12** (1961), 313-318.
[5] P. Frankl, *On Sperner families satisfying an additional condition*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **20** 1-11 (1976).
[6] P. Frankl, *The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem is true for $n = ckt$*, in Combinatorial Proc. Fifth Hungarian Coll. Combinatorics, Keszthely, 1976, North-Holland, Amsterdam. 1978, 365-375.
[7] P. Frankl, *An extremal problem for two families of sets*, European J. Combin. **3** (1982) 125-127.
[8] P. Frankl and N. Tokushige, *On r-Cross intersecting Families of Sets*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, **20** 749-752.
[9] Z. Füredi, *Geometrical Solution of an Intersection Problem for Two Hypergraphs*, Europ. J. Combinatorics (1984) **5**, 133-136.
[10] Z. Király, Z. L. Nagy, D. Pálvőlgyi, M. Visontai, *Fundamenta Informaticae* (1–4) (2012), 189–198.
[11] L. Lovász, Combinatorial Problems and Exercises, North-Holland, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1979.
[12] J. Talbot, *A new Bollobas-type inequality and applications to t-intersecting families of sets* , Discrete Math. **285** (2004), 349-353.
[13] R. Wilson, *The exact bound in the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem*, Combinatorica **4** (1984) 247–257.

(Dong Yeap Kang) Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, 291 Daehak-ro Yuseong-gu Daejeon, 305-701 South Korea

(Jaehoon Kim) Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, 291 Daehak-ro Yuseong-gu Daejeon, 305-701 South Korea / School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom

(Younjin Kim) Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, 291 Daehak-ro Yuseong-gu Daejeon, 305-701 South Korea

E-mail address: dynamical@kaist.ac.kr
E-mail address: kimjs@bham.ac.uk, mutualteon@gmail.com
E-mail address: younjin@kaist.ac.kr